



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,573	11/13/2001	William A. Sullivan	WAS-1	4330
27157	7590	11/05/2003	EXAMINER	
GREENWALD & BASCH, LLP 349 WEST COMMERCIAL STREET, SUITE 2490 EAST ROCHESTER, NY 14445			LAMB, TWYLER MARIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
DATE MAILED: 11/05/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,573	SULLIVAN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Twyler M. Lamb	2622		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 August 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant (s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment B filed on 8/11/03.
2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 1-22 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-12 and 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (Wagner) (US 5,887,408) in view of Bachelder et al. (Bachelder) (US 3,652,281).

With regard to claims 1, 10 and 21-22, Wagner discloses a method for reducing a thickness of a compressible substrate bearing an image (col 3, line 41 – col 4, line 1), the substrate having an initial thickness (col 4, lines 25-54), comprising: applying a compressive force to the substrate to compress the substrate to a thickness less than the initial thickness (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33), the compressive force selected to preclude the substrate returning to the initial thickness after removal of the compressive force therefrom (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

Wagner differs from claim 1 in that he does not clearly teach concurrently applying heat to the substrate.

Bachelder discloses a photosensitive film unit that includes concurrently applying heat to the substrate (col 12, lines 34-51).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner to include concurrently applying heat to the substrate as taught by Bachelder. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner by the teaching of Bachelder to manufacture thinner sheets as taught by Bachelder in col 12, lines 34-51.

With regard to claim 2, Wagner also discloses wherein the compressive force is adjustable so as to achieve a desired thickness for the substrate after compression (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

With regard to claims 3 and 11, Wagner also discloses wherein the compressive force is applied by passing the substrate through a roller nip formed between two adjacent rollers (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

Wagner differs from claim 3 in that he does not clearly teach concurrently applying heat to the substrate.

Bachelder discloses a photosensitive film unit that includes concurrently applying heat to the substrate (col 12, lines 34-51).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner to include concurrently applying heat to the substrate as taught by Bachelder. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner by the teaching of Bachelder to manufacture thinner sheets as taught by Bachelder in col 12, lines 34-51.

With regard to claims 4 and 12, Wagner also discloses wherein the pressure applied to the substrate as it passes through the nip is in the range of 0 to 400 pounds per linear inch (col 4, lines 58-63).

With regard to claim 5, Wagner also discloses wherein the recited steps are repeatedly applied to a plurality of substrate sheets which are further processed to form a bound document consisting essentially of reduced thickness pages (which reads on a predetermined number of sheets) (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

With regard to claims 7 and 17, Wagner discloses a method for reducing a thickness of a compressible substrate bearing an image (col 3, line 41 – col 4, line 1), comprising forming an image on a substrate (col 3, lines 41-54), and concurrently compressing to transform the substrate to the compressed state without substantially distorting the image (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33), the substrate transformable from an imaging state having a first thickness to a compressed state having a second thickness thinner than the first (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

Wagner differs from claim 7 in that he does not clearly teach concurrently applying heat to the substrate.

Bachelder discloses a photosensitive film unit that includes concurrently applying heat to the substrate (col 12, lines 34-51).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner to include concurrently applying heat to the

substrate as taught by Bachelder. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner by the teaching of Bachelder to manufacture thinner sheets as taught by Bachelder in col 12, lines 34-51.

With regard to claim 18, Wagner also discloses wherein the low density bulking material is compressible (which reads on a predetermined number of sheets) (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

With regard to claim 19, Wagner also discloses wherein the low density bulking material includes a structure that is collapsible so as to increase its density (which reads on a predetermined number of sheets) (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

With regard to claim 20, Wagner also discloses wherein the low density bulking material is a corrugated layer that forms part of the substrate matrix (which reads on a predetermined number of sheets) (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (Wagner) (US 5,887,408) in view of Brady et al. (Brady) (US 6,100,804).

With regard to claim 6, Wagner also discloses wherein the compressive force is applied by passing the substrate through a roller nip between two adjacent rollers (col 4, line 51 – col 6, line 33).

Wagner differs from claim 6 in that he does not clearly teach the compressive force is adjustable by adjusting a nip pressure so as to produce a compressed substrate having a thickness in the range of 100% to 50% that of the initial thickness.

Brady discloses the use of "thermal compression bonding" (col 8, lines 1-10) that includes the compressive force is adjustable so as to achieve a desired thickness for the substrate after compression (which reads on reducing the thickness to less than approximately 200 microns {with in the range of 100% to 50% of the initial thickness}) (col 3, lines 5-40; col 7, lines 27-40; col 8, lines 1-10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner to include the compressive force is adjustable so as to achieve a desired thickness for the substrate after compression as taught by Brady. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner by the teaching of Brady to manufacture thinner wafers as taught by Brady in col 3, lines 6-10.

4. Claims 8, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (Wagner) (US 5,887,408) in view of Bachelder et al. (Bachelder) (US 3,652,281) as applied to claim 7 above and further in view of Morikawa (US 5,854,957).

With regard to claim 8, Wagner as modified does not teach wherein the image is produced on the substrate using a toner disposition process, and wherein the step of concurrently compressing and heating the imaged substrate causes the toner image to smoothen and produces an improved glossy image quality.

Morikawa also discloses wherein the image is produced on the substrate using a toner disposition process (col 5, lines 31-39), and wherein the step of concurrently compressing and heating the imaged substrate causes the toner image to smoothen

and produces an improved glossy image quality (which reads on removing the remaining toner downstream and the toner being applied by a thermal fixing unit) (col 5, line 59 – col 6, line 2).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner to include wherein the image is produced on the substrate using a toner disposition process, and wherein the step of concurrently compressing and heating the imaged substrate causes the toner image to smoothen and produces an improved glossy image quality as taught by Brady. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wagner by the teaching of Morikawa to remove the remaining toner downstream as taught by Morikawa in col 5, line 59 – col 6, line 2.

With regard to claim 16, Wagner as modified does not teach comprising at least one stripper finger to assist with the removal of the substrate from the roller surface after the substrate passes through the nip.

Morikawa comprising at least one stripper finger (switching claw 601) to assist with the removal of the substrate from the roller surface after the substrate passes through the nip (which reads on guiding the sheet) (col 6, lines 54-57).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner to include comprising at least one stripper finger to assist with the removal of the substrate from the roller surface after the substrate passes through the nip as taught by Morikawa. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified

Wagner by the teaching of Morikawa to remove the remaining toner downstream as taught by Morikawa in col 5, line 59 – col 6, line 2.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (Wagner) (US 5,887,408) in view of Bachelder et al. (Bachelder) (US 3,652,281) and further in view of Morikawa (US 5,854,957) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Matsuda et al. (Matsuda) (US 5,925,446).

With regard to claim 9, Wagner as modified differs from claim 9 in that he does not clearly teach including the step of applying a release agent to a surface that contacts the image during the compressing and heating step as to prevent the image from transferring to the surface.

Matsuda discloses an image forming method that includes the step of applying a release agent to a surface that contacts the image during the compressing and heating step as to prevent the image from transferring to the surface (col 4, lines 26-35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner to include the step of applying a release agent to a surface that contacts the image during the compressing and heating step as to prevent the image from transferring to the surface as taught by Matsuda. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner by the teaching of Matsuda go prevent image stain on a second surface as taught by Matsuda in col 4, lines 26-35.

6. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (Wagner) (US 5,887,408) in view of Bachelder et al. (Bachelder) (US 3,652,281) and further in view of Morikawa (US 5,854,957) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Kinoshita et al. (Kinoshita) (US 5,287,150).

With regard to claim 13, Wagner as modified differs from claim 13 in that he does not clearly teach at least one of said rollers includes a resilient outer surface so as to compensate for any unevenness in the rollers.

Kinoshita discloses a developing roller that includes at least one of said rollers includes a resilient outer surface so as to compensate for any unevenness in the rollers (col 9, lines 46-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner to include at least one of said rollers includes a resilient outer surface so as to compensate for any unevenness in the rollers as taught by Kinoshita. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner by the teaching of Kinoshita to aid in preventing toner grains from penetrating the roller as taught by Kinoshita in col 9, lines 46-55.

With regard to claim 14, Wagner as modified differs from claim 14 in that he does not clearly teach at least one roll is formed from aluminum and an outer surface thereof is anodized.

Kinoshita discloses a developing roller that includes at least one roll is formed from aluminum and an outer surface thereof is anodized (col 6, lines 29-50).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner to include at least one roll is formed from aluminum and an outer surface thereof is anodized as taught by Kinoshita. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner by the teaching of Kinoshita to aid in preventing toner grains from penetrating the roller as taught by Kinoshita in col 9, lines 46-55.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. (Wagner) (US 5,887,408) in view of Bachelder et al. (Bachelder) (US 3,652,281) and further in view of Morikawa (US 5,854,957) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Kinoshita et al. (Kinoshita) (US 5,287,150) and Matsuda et al. (Matsuda) (US 5,925,446).

With regard to claim 15, Wagner as modified differs from claim 15 in that he does not clearly teach at least one roll further includes a urethane coating applied over the outer surface thereof.

Matsuda discloses an image forming method that includes the step of applying a release agent to a surface that contacts the image during the compressing and heating step as to prevent the image from transferring to the surface (col 4, lines 26-35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner to include the step of applying a release agent to a surface that contacts the image during the compressing and heating step as to prevent the image from transferring to the surface as taught by Matsuda. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have further modified Wagner by the teaching of Matsuda to prevent image stain on a second surface as taught by Matsuda in col 4, lines 26-35.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Twyler Lamb whose telephone number is 703 - 308-8823. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 703-308-4712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

(for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or hand-carried to:

Application/Control Number: 10/010,573
Art Unit: 2622

Page 12

Crystal Park Two
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA.
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Twyler Lamb



November 3, 2003